

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JEROME JUNIOR WASHINGTON,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 17 – 988
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Chief District Judge Joy Flowers Conti
	)	Magistrate Judge Lisa Pupo Lenihan
SUPERINTENDENT GILMORE, <i>et</i>	)	
<i>al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Jerome Junior Washington (“Plaintiff”) is an inmate currently incarcerated in the State Correctional Institution at Greene. He initiated the instant pro se prisoner civil rights action with the filing of a Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* on August 10, 2017 (ECF No. 3) and his complaint was docketed on August 29, 2017 (ECF No. 5). In accordance with the Magistrate Judge’s Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and Rules 72.C and 72.D of the Local Rules of Court, all pretrial matters were referred to a United States Magistrate Judge.

On February 6, 2018, defendants, with the exception of Mr. Toma, filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint for Improper Joinder of Claims. (ECF No. 18.) Plaintiff filed a response in opposition to the defendants’ Motion to Dismiss on March 15, 2018. (ECF No. 27.) In addition, on May 24, 2018, Plaintiff filed a pleading entitled “Joinder for Multiple Claims for Commonwealth Defendants to be Joined Together; Claims” in which he maintained that he should be able to “bring as many claims as possible against [a particular defendant] in that same caption case.” (ECF No. 33, ¶ 1.)

On June 22, 2018, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), recommending that defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Improper Joinder of Claims be granted to the extent that Plaintiff’s complaint should be stricken for his failure to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20. She also recommended that the court allow Plaintiff the opportunity to file an amended complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 38.) The R&R was served on the parties and Plaintiff filed a “Motion with the Court in Response to Defendants Report and Recommendation” (ECF No. 42), which the court has interpreted as objections to the magistrate judge’s R&R.

In resolving a party’s objections, the court conducts a *de novo* review of any part of the R&R to which proper objections were made. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The court may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition, as well as receive further evidence or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. *Id.*

Plaintiff’s objections, like his complaint, are difficult to decipher and do not appear to address the magistrate judge’s recommended disposition of defendants’ motion. Instead, he complains that his property (consisting of books, crayons and markers, legal work, shower shoes, pictures, a cap, dictionary, writing pads, etc.) has been confiscated in retaliation and to prohibit his access to the court. He also claims that he is without access to the law library, legal assistance, counsel, a jail house lawyer, money, and family support. Despite these deficiencies, however, Plaintiff does not address the magistrate judge’s argument that his complaint violates Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20 in that it “includes an array of unrelated claims against various Commonwealth Defendants for events that allegedly occurred over the course of seven months in 2017.” (ECF No. 38, p. 5.) In fact, there appears to be no part of the R&R to which

Plaintiff properly objects. Therefore, after careful *de novo* review, an appropriate order will be entered.

Dated: August 14, 2018

By the Court:

/s/ Joy Flowers Conti

Joy Flowers Conti  
Chief United States District Judge

cc: Jerome Junior Washington  
HV-0282  
SCI Greene  
175 Progress Drive  
Waynesburg, PA 15370

Counsel for Defendants  
(Via CM/ECF electronic mail)